Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—The minimum was about Rs. 33 per candy.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—So the minimum was Rs. 33, and then what was the maximum ?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—The maximum was Rs. 73 per candy.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—With regard to teak what were the minimum and the maximum ?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—The maximum for teak was Rs. 41 per candy.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—And the minimum ?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—I think it was Rs. 27 and odd.

Sale of rosewood to Mr. Mugaseth.

202. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—(1) Will the Government be pleased to state whether 2,000 candies of rosewood have been sold to Mr. Mugaseth by private negotiation in 1103 without tender or public auction ;

(2) if so, (a) the date of the same, (b) the measurement, (c) classification list of the logs and (d) the rates per candy for the different sizes ;

(3) what measurement was considered topling in this contract ;

(4) when were these transported to Ernakulam to Mr. Mugaseth's premises ;

(5) whether there were departmental passes issued for the same; and if so, when ;

(6) (a) who are the officers on the way who have to check these passes ; (b) whether they checked these logs and (c) if so, how the checking is done ;

(7) (a) whether any red passes have been issued for these logs ; (b) if so, by whom and (c) when and (d) why was this deviation from the *Forest Code* made in this case ;

(8) (a) what is the amount paid towards the contract, and (b) what is the balance, if any, due under this contract to the Forest and Tramway Departments until the last day of Karkadagam 1103 ?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—(1) Yes, but not in 1103.

(2) (a) 20th April 1926.

(b) & (c). Copies of the lists giving the particulars are placed on the Council Table.

(d) Rs. 18 per candy for logs and Rs. 10 per candy for toplings.

(3) Under 14 *vannams*.

(4) In 1102 and 1103.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(5) There were no passes, but there were invoices and way bills.

(6) (a). Chalakkudi Tanahdar and Depot Forester.

(b) Yes.

(c) With invoices and way bills.

(7) (a) No.

(b) and (c). No answer is necessary in view of the reply to (a) above.

(d) The subordinates who allowed the transport without passes have been called upon to explain their action.

(8) (a) Rs. 35,000.

(b) Forest—Rs. 20,351- 11- 3.

Tramway—Rs. 22,090- 11- 10.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Is there any order with regard to the measurement of toplings of any timber which is to be treated as topling? Is it not timber below 6 *vannams* that is treated as toplings?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Yes.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Then why was this timber below 14 *vannams* treated as toplings?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—That was the measurement fixed for that particular contract.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—What was the special reason for showing this consideration, when, ordinarily, timber below 6 *vannams* only is treated as toplings? Why was this contractor given this special rate?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Perhaps it may be considering the quantity of timber under that particular contract.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Was there any real difference in the timber which was treated as topling?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—I cannot say.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Why?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Because I have not seen that timber.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—The answer to (5) is 'There were no passes, but there were invoices and way bills.' So the timber was transported without passes. Is it not a violation of the Forest Rule?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—Yes, it is a violation.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Why was that followed in this particular case?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—The answer is given. It is 'the subordinates who allowed the transport without passes have been called upon to explain their action.'

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—What was the explanation given?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—The explanation has not yet been received.

President.—The transport occurred in 1102 and 1103. So you must have called for explanation long before.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—When was this explanation called for?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—I do not remember the date.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—You may refer to the file and give the information.

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—I have not got the file here.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Was the explanation called for after the receipt of this question by the Government?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—For that also I want notice.

Contractors of the Forest Department for felling timber in 1104.

203. Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) the names of the contractors to whom the contracts for felling and collection of timber budgetted for in 1104 were given by the Forest Department;

(2) the quantities to be collected as per the different contracts and the names of the coupes from which these are to be collected;

(3) quantities collected and measured under these contracts and the quantities yet to be collected from these coupes;

(4) have all the trees been marked as per the tender notification; if so, how many in each coupe and in each species;

(5) was any fresh marking done after the tender notification; if so, how many trees were marked; the list of such trees may be kindly placed on the Table;

(6) did the contractors collect the timber from distant areas or from areas near the Tram line and how many trees thus collected are below 14 *vannams* and were these treated as toplings as the case of the seigniorage rosewood contract of Mr. Mugaseth?

Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.—(1) (a) Mr. C. T. Chinnava Rowther.

(b) Mr. A. R. Joseph.

(c) Mr. C. P. Luiz.

(2) (a) 5,600 candies from D1, D3, D4 and D11.

(b) 1. 800 candies from D6 and D10 coupes.

2. 2,600 candies from behind C1 coupe.

(c) 2,500 candies from O. W. C. coupe.

3) (a) Collected 4,306 candies.

To be collected 1,294 candies.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly